

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

ESTATE OF MICHELLE EVETTE MCCALL, ET AL.,

Appellants,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Appellee.

CASE NO. SC11-1148

CERTIFIED QUESTION FROM THE
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 11TH CIRCUIT
(Lower Tribunal Case No. 07-00508CV-3-MCR/EMT)

AMICI CURIAE BRIEF OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ORTHOPAEDIC SURGEONS, AMERICAN
CONGRESS OF OBSTETRICIANS AND GYNECOLOGISTS, CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, HEALTH
COALITION ON LIABILITY AND ACCESS, PHYSICIANS INSURERS
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, PROPERTY CASUALTY INSURERS
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL
INSURANCE COMPANIES, AND NFIB SMALL BUSINESS LEGAL CENTER
IN SUPPORT OF APPELLEE

Mark A. Behrens (*pro hac*)
Cary Silverman (*pro hac*)
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
1155 F Street, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20004
Phone: (202) 783-8400
Fax: (202) 783-4211
mbehrens@shb.com
csilverman@shb.com

Michael L. Rosen
(Fla. Bar No. 243531)
SHOOK HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
100 N. Tampa Street, Suite 2900
Tampa, FL 33602-5810
Phone: (813) 202-7100
Fax: (813) 221-8837
mrosen@shb.com
Attorneys for *Amici Curiae*

INDEX

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
QUESTION PRESENTED	1
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
STATEMENT OF THE FACTS.....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	1
ARGUMENT	3
I. THE EVOLUTION AND RISE OF NONECONOMIC DAMAGES. 3	
II. LIMITS ON SUBJECTIVE NONECONOMIC DAMAGES ARE A KEY COMPONENT OF ACCESSIBLE HEALTH CARE SYSTEMS.....	5
A. Avoiding Unpredictable and Excessive Awards.....	6
B. Reducing the Cost of Medical Liability Insurance	6
C. Increasing Access to Health Care for Local Residents.....	7
D. Reducing the Cost of Defensive Medicine	8
III. EXPERIENCE SHOWS THAT LIMITING NONECONOMIC DAMAGES IMPROVES ACCESSIBILITY TO HEALTH CARE .	10
A. Case Study: Mississippi	10
B. Case Study: West Virginia	12
IV. NUMEROUS STATES HAVE UPHELD LIMITS ON NONECONOMIC DAMAGES.....	15
CONCLUSION	20

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE..... 21
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 9.210 24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES</u>	<u>Page</u>
<i>Adams v. Via Christi Reg'l Med. Ctr.</i> , 19 P.3d 132 (Kan. 2001).....	17, 19
<i>Arbino v. Johnson & Johnson</i> , 880 N.E.2d 420 (Ohio 2007).....	16, 19
<i>Atlanta Oculoplastic Surgery, P.C. v. Nestlehutt</i> , 691 S.E.2d 218 (Ga. 2010)	18
<i>Arneson v. Olson</i> , 270 N.W.2d 125 (N.D. 1978).....	18
<i>Boyd v. Bulala</i> , 877 F.2d 1191 (4th Cir. 1989).....	17
<i>Brannigan v. Usitalo</i> , 587 A.2d 1232 (N.H. 1991).....	18
<i>Butler v. Flint Goodrich Hosp. of Dillard Univ.</i> , 607 So. 2d 517 (La. 1992)	16, 19
<i>C.J. v. Dep't of Corrections</i> , 151 P.3d 373 (Alaska 2006).....	16
<i>Davis v. Omitowoju</i> , 883 F.2d 1155 (3d Cir. 1989).....	17
<i>DRD Pool Serv., Inc. v. Freed</i> , 5 A.3d 45 (Md. 2010)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Estate of McCall ex rel. McCall v. United States</i> , 663 F. Supp. 2d 1276 (N.D. Fla. 2009), <i>aff'd in part, question certified</i> , 642 F.3d 944 (11th Cir. 2011).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Estate of Verba v. Ghaphery</i> , 552 S.E.2d 406 (W. Va. 2001)	16
<i>Etheridge v. Med. Ctr. Hosp.</i> , 376 S.E.2d 525 (Va. 1989)	16
<i>Evans ex rel. Kutch v. State</i> , 56 P.3d 1046 (Alaska 2002).....	16
<i>Federal Express Corp. v. United States</i> , 228 F. Supp. 2d 1267 (D. N.M. 2002)	17
<i>Fein v. Permanente Med. Group</i> , 695 P.2d 665 (Cal. 1985)	15, 19
<i>Ferdon v. Wisconsin Patients Comp. Fund</i> , 701 N.W.2d 440 (Wis. 2005).....	18
<i>Franklin v. Mazda Motor Corp.</i> , 704 F. Supp. 1325 (D. Md. 1989).....	18

<i>Garhart v. Columbia/Healthone, L.L.C.</i> , 95 P.3d 571 (Colo. 2004)	16
<i>Gilbert v. DaimlerChrysler Corp.</i> , 685 N.W.2d 391 (Mich. 2004), <i>cert. denied</i> , 546 U.S. 821 (2005).....	2
<i>Gourley v. Neb. Methodist Health Sys., Inc.</i> , 663 N.W.2d 43 (Neb. 2003).....	16, 19
<i>HCA Health Servs. of Fla., Inc. v. Branchesi</i> , 620 So. 2d 176 (Fla. 1993)	16
<i>Hoffman v. United States</i> , 767 F.2d 1431 (9th Cir. 1985)	17
<i>Johnson v. St. Vincent Hosp.</i> , 404 N.E.2d 585 (Ind. 1980)	16, 19
<i>Judd v. Drezga</i> , 103 P.3d 135 (Utah 2004).....	16
<i>King v. Virginia Birth-Related Neurological Injury Comp. Program</i> , 410 S.E.2d 656 (Va. 1991).....	17
<i>Kirkland v. Blaine County Med. Ctr.</i> , 4 P.3d 1115 (Idaho 2000).....	16, 19
<i>Klotz v. St. Anthony’s Med. Ctr.</i> , 311 S.W.3d 752 (Mo. 2010)	18
<i>L.D.G., Inc. v. Brown</i> , 211 P.3d 1110 (Alaska 2009).....	19
<i>Lakin v. Senco Prods. Inc.</i> , 987 P.2d 463 (Or. 1999)	18
<i>Lawson v. Hoke</i> , 119 P.3d 210 (Or. 2005).....	17
<i>LeBron v. Gottlieb Mem. Hosp.</i> , 930 N.E.2d 895 (Ill. 2010).....	18
<i>Leiker v. Gafford</i> , 778 P.2d 823 (Kan. 1989).....	17
<i>Lucas v. United States</i> , 757 S.W.2d 687 (Tex. 1988).....	18
<i>MacDonald v. City Hosp., Inc.</i> , 2011 WL 2517201 (W. Va. June 22, 2011)....	<i>passim</i>
<i>M.D. v. United States</i> , 745 F. Supp. 2d 1274 (M.D. Fla. 2010)	18
<i>Mizrahi v. North Miami Med. Ctr., Ltd.</i> , 761 So. 2d 1040 (Fla. 2000).....	17
<i>Moore v. Mobile Infirmary Assoc.</i> , 592 So. 2d 156 (Ala. 1991)	18

<i>Murphy v. Edmonds</i> , 601 A.2d 102 (Md. 1992)	16
<i>Nelson v. Keefer</i> , 451 F.2d 289 (3d Cir. 1971)	4
<i>Oaks v. Connors</i> , 600 A.2d 423 (Md. 1995)	16
<i>Owen v. United States</i> , 935 F.2d 734 (5th Cir. 1991), <i>cert. denied</i> , 502 U.S. 1031 (1992)	17
<i>Parham v. Florida Health Sciences Ctr.</i> , 35 So. 3d 920 (Fla. 2d DCA 2010)	16
<i>Patton v. TIC United Corp.</i> , 77 F.3d 1235 (10th Cir.), <i>cert. denied</i> , 518 U.S. 1005 (1996)	17
<i>Peters v. Saft</i> , 597 A.2d 50 (Me. 1991)	17
<i>Pulliam v. Coastal Emer. Servs. of Richmond, Inc.</i> , 509 S.E.2d 307 (Va. 1999)	16, 19
<i>Robinson v. Charleston Area Med. Ctr., Inc.</i> , 414 S.E.2d 877 (W. Va. 1991)	16
<i>Rose v. Doctors Hosp.</i> , 801 S.W.2d 841 (Tex. 1990)	16, 19
<i>Samples v. Florida Birth-Related Neurological</i> , 40 So. 3d 18 (Fla. 5th DCA 2010)	17
<i>Samsel v. Wheeler Transp. Servs., Inc.</i> , 789 P.2d 541 (Kan. 1990), <i>overruled in</i> <i>part on other grounds</i> , <i>Bair v. Peck</i> , 811 P.2d 1176 (Kan. 1991)	16, 19
<i>Scharrel v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 949 P.2d 89 (Colo. Ct. App. 1998)	16
<i>Scholz v. Metro. Pathologists, P.C.</i> , 851 P.2d 901 (Colo. 1993)	16
<i>Schweich v. Ziegler, Inc.</i> , 463 N.W.2d 722 (Minn. 1990)	17
<i>Simms v. Holiday Inns, Inc.</i> , 746 F. Supp. 596 (D. Md. 1990)	17
<i>Smith v. Botsford Gen. Hosp.</i> , 419 F.3d 513 (6th Cir. 2005), <i>cert. denied</i> , 347 U.S. 1111 (2006)	17
<i>Smith v. Dep't of Ins.</i> , 507 So. 2d 1080 (Fla. 1987)	18

<i>Sofie v. Fibreboard Corp.</i> , 771 P.2d 711 (Wash. 1989)	18
<i>Stinnett v. Tam</i> , 2011 WL 3862642 (Cal. App. Sept. 1, 2011)	15
<i>Univ. of Miami v. Echarte</i> , 618 So. 2d 189 (Fla.), <i>cert. denied</i> , 510 U.S. 915 (1993)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Van Buren v. Evans</i> , 2009 WL 1396235 (Cal. App. May 20, 2009)	16
<i>Vick v. Schulman</i> , 2001 WL 1829895 (Va. Cir. Ct. Dec. 21, 2001)	17
<i>Watson v. Hortman</i> , 2010 WL 3566736 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 13, 2010)	18
<i>Weingrad v. Miles</i> , 29 So. 3d 406 (Fla. 3d DCA 2010)	16
<i>Wessels v. Garden Way, Inc.</i> , 689 N.W.2d 526 (Mich. App. 2004)	17, 19
<i>Yates v. Pollock</i> , 194 Cal. App. 3d 195 (1987)	16
<i>Zdrojewski v. Murphy</i> , 657 N.W.2d 721 (Mich. App. 2002)	16

STATUTES

Alaska Stat. § 09.17.010	15
Alaska Stat. § 09.55.549	15
Cal. Civ. Code § 3333.2(b)	15
Colo. Rev. Stat. § 13-21-102.5	15
Colo. Rev. Stat. § 13-64-302	14
§ 766.118, Fla. Stat.	<i>passim</i>
§ 766.201, Fla. Stat.	2
Haw. Rev. Stat. § 663-8.7	15
H.B. 2, 2002 3 rd Ex. Sess. (Miss. 2002) (codified at Miss. Code Ann. § 11-1-60(2)(a))	11

H.B. 13, 2004 1 st Ex. Sess., § 2 (Miss. 2004) (codified at Miss Code Ann. § 11-1-60(2)(a)).....	11
Idaho Code § 6-1603	15
Ind. Code § 34-18-14-3	15
Kan. Stat. Ann. § 60-19a02	15
La. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 40:1299.42	15
Md. Cts. & Jud. Proc. Code Ann. § 3-2A-09	15
Md. Ct. & Jud. Proc. Code Ann. § 11-108.....	15
Mich. Comp. Laws § 600.1483	15
Miss. Code Ann. § 11-1-60	15
Mo. Rev. Stat. § 538.210.....	15
Neb. Rev. Stat. § 44-2825	15
N.C. Gen. Stat. § 90-21.19 (added by N.C. Sess. L. 2011-400)	15
Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 2315.18	15
Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 2323.43	15
23 Okla. Stat. § 61.2.....	15
S.C. Code Ann. § 15-32-220.....	15
S.D. Codified Laws § 21-3-11	15
Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Ann. § 74.301.....	15
W. Va. Code § 55-7B-8.....	14

OTHER AUTHORITY

Ronald J. Allen & Alexia Brunet, *The Judicial Treatment of Non-economic Compensatory Damages in the Nineteenth Century*, 4. J. Empirical Legal Stud. 365 (2007).....3

American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, *The Current Tort System* (2003), available at http://www.acog.org/from_home/publications/press_releases/Stats-ACM03-CurrentTorts.pdf 13

American Medical Association, *Medical Liability Reform – NOW!* (Feb. 1, 2011), available at <http://www.ama-assn.org/ama1/pub/upload/mm/378/mlr-now-2011.pdf>.....12

Perry J. Argires, *There is an Attack on Medical Profession*, Sunday News (Lancaster, Pa.), May 16, 2004, at 1, available at 2004 WLNR 11275958.....4

Ronen Avraham, *An Empirical Study of the Impact of Tort Reforms on Medical Malpractice Settlement Payments*, 36 J. of Legal Studies S183 (2007).....6

Robert L. Barbieri, *Professional Liability Payments in Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 107:3 *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 578 (Mar. 2006).....7

Mark A. Behrens, *Medical Liability Reform: A Case Study of Mississippi*, 118:2 *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 335 (Aug. 2011).....11

Mark A. Behrens & Cary Silverman, *Now Open for Business: The Transformation of Mississippi’s Legal Climate*, 24 *Miss. C.L. Rev.* 393 (2005).....12

Melvin M. Belli, *The Adequate Award*, 39 *Cal. L. Rev.* 1 (1951).....3

Ralph Blumenthal, *More Doctors in Texas After Malpractice Cap*, *N.Y. Times*, Oct. 5, 2007, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/05/us/05doctors.html>7

Kim Brimer, *Has “Pain and Suffering” Priced Itself Out of the Market*, *Ins. J.*, Sept. 8, 2003, available at <http://www.insurancejournal.com/magazines/southcentral/2003/09/08/partingshots/32172.htm>5

Chiu-Fang Chou & Anthony T. Lo Sasso, *Practice Location Choice by New Physicians: The Importance of Malpractice Premiums, Damage Caps, and Health Professional Shortage Area Designation*, 44 Health Serv. Res. 1271 (2009), available at 2009 WLNR 15574372.....7

Therese Smith Cox, *Doctors Facing Dilemma: Neurosurgeons Must Pay Big Malpractice Fee or Leave*, Charleston Gazette, Apr. 10, 2002, at A1, available at 2002 WL 105324413

Sarag Domin, Comment, *Where Have All the Baby-Doctors Gone? Women’s Access to Healthcare in Jeopardy: Obstetrics and the Medical Malpractice Insurance Crisis*, 53 Cath. U. L. Rev. 499 (2004)11

William E. Encinosa & Fred J. Hellinger, *Have State Caps on Malpractice Awards Increased the Supply of Physicians?*, 24 Health Aff. 250 (2005), available at <http://content.healthaffairs.org/content/early/2005/05/31/hlthaff.w5.250.full.pdf>7

Governor’s Select Task Force on Healthcare Professional Liability Insurance, Report (2003), available at <http://www.doh.state.fl.us/myflorida/DOH-Large-Final%20Book.pdf>2

Robert P. Hartwig, *Medical Malpractice Insurance & The Insurance Cycle: Medical Professional Liability & the P/C Insurance Industry* (Ins. Info. Inst. May 15, 2008), available at http://www.iii.org/assets/docs/pdf/Medmal_preso1.pdf5

Stanley Ingber, *Rethinking Intangible Injuries: A Focus on Remedy*, 73 Cal. L. Rev. 772 (1985)1

Lynne Jeter, *Tort Reform Impact Ripples Out Through Economy*, Miss. Bus. J., Nov. 29, 2004, at S30, available at 2004 WL 1444507410

Sherman Joyce & Michael Hotra, *Mississippi’s Civil Justice System: Problems, Opportunities, and Some Suggested Repairs*, 71 Miss. L.J. 395 (2001)10

Carol Kane & David Emmons, *The Impact of Liability Pressure and Caps on Damages on the Healthcare Market: An Update of Recent Literature* (Am. Med. Ass’n 2007), available at <http://www.ama-assn.org/ama1/pub/upload/mm/363/prp2007-1.pdf>6

Carly N. Kelly & Michelle M. Mello, *Are Medical Malpractice Damages Caps Constitutional? An Overview of State Litigation*, 33 J.L. Med. & Ethics 515 (2005) 18-19

Daniel P. Kessler et al., *Impact of Malpractice Reforms on the Supply of Physician Services*, 293 JAMA 2618 (2005).....7

Daniel P. Kessler & Mark B. McClellan, *Do Doctors Practice Defensive Medicine?* (Nat’l Bur. of Econ. Analysis, Working Paper No. 5466, 1996), available at <http://www.nber.org/papers/w5466.pdf>.....9

Meredith L. Kilgore et al., *Tort Law and Medical Malpractice Insurance Premiums*, 43 Inquiry 255 (2006)..... 6-7

Joseph H. King, Jr., *Pain and Suffering, Noneconomic Damages, and the Goals of Tort Law*, 57 SMU L. Rev. 163 (2004)4

David W. Leebron, *Final Moments: Damages for Pain and Suffering Prior to Death*, 64 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 256 (1989)4

Tim Lemke, *Best Places to Sue? Big Civil Verdicts in Mississippi Attract Major Litigators*, Wash. Times, June 30, 2002, at A1, available at 2002 WLNR 402634.....10

Massachusetts Medical Society, Press Release, *MMS First-of-its-kind Survey of Physicians Shows Extent and Cost of the Practice of Defensive Medicine and its Multiple Effects of Health Care on the State* (Nov. 17, 2008), available at http://www.massmed.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Advocacy_and_Policy&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=235598

Philip L. Merkel, *Pain and Suffering Damages at Mid-Twentieth Century: A Retrospective View of the Problem and the Legal Academy’s First Responses*, 34 Cap. U. L. Rev. 545 (2006) 3-4

Dawn Miller, *CAMC Loses Trauma Status: People With Serious Multiple Injuries to go to Morgantown, Elsewhere*, Charleston Gazette, Aug. 24, 2002, at 1A, available at 2002 WLNR 1058321.....13

National Governors Ass’n Center for Best Practices, *Addressing the Medical Malpractice Insurance Crisis* (2002), *available at* <http://www.nga.org/cda/files/1102medmalpractice.pdf> 12-13

Leonard J. Nelson et al., *Medical Malpractice Reform in Three Southern States*, 4 J. Health & Biomedical L. 69 (2008).....9. 11

Paul V. Niemeyer, *Awards for Pain and Suffering: The Irrational Centerpiece of Our Tort System*, 90 Va. L. Rev. 1401 (2004)5

Joseph Nixon, Editorial, *Why Doctors Are Heading for Texas*, Wall St. J., May 17, 2008, at A9, , *abstract available at* 2008 WLNR 94197387

Donald J. Palmisano, *Health Care in Crisis: The Need for Medical Liability Reform*, 5 Yale J. Health Pol’y, L. & Ethics 371 (2005).....9

Victor E. Schwartz et al., *Fostering Mutual Respect and Cooperation Between State Courts and State Legislatures: A Sound Alternative to a Tort Tug of War*, 103 W. Va. L. Rev. 1 (2000).....19

Amy Lynn Sorrel, *Tort Reforms Boost Some States' Liability Outlook*, Am. Med. News, Mar. 5, 2007, *available at* <http://www.ama-assn.org/amednews/2007/03/05/prsc0305.htm>12

Ronald M. Stewart, *Malpractice Risk and Cost are Significantly Reduced After Tort Reform*, 212 J. Am. Coll. Surg. 463 (2011)2

David M. Studdert et al., *Defensive Medicine Among High-Risk Specialist Physicians in a Volatile Malpractice Environment*, 293:1 JAMA 2609 (June 1, 2005).....8

Towers Watson, *U.S. Tort Cost Trends: 2010 Update*, *available at* <http://www.towerswatson.com/assets/pdf/3424/Towers-Watson-Tort-Report-1.pdf>5

U.S. Dep’t of Health & Human Servs., *Confronting the New Health Care Crisis: Improving Health Care Quality and Lowering Costs By Fixing Our Medical Liability System* 4 (2002), *available at* <http://aspe.hhs.gov/daltcp/reports/litrefm.htm>9

Neil Vidmar, *Empirical Evidence on the Deep Pockets Hypothesis: Jury Awards for Pain and Suffering in Medical Malpractice Cases*, 43 Duke L.J. 217 (1993)1

W. Va. Bd. of Med., *Licensure Activity*, available at <http://www.wvbom.wv.gov/activity.asp>.....13, 15

W. Va. Mut. Ins. Co., *Quarterly Coverage (Spring 2011)*, available at <http://www.wvmic.com/docs/QuarterlyCoverageSpring2011.pdf>.....14

W. Va. Mut. Ins. Co., *Annual Rep. (2009)*, available at <http://www.wvmic.com/docs/2009%20WV%20Mutual%20Annual%20Report.pdf>14

W. Va. Offices of the Ins. Comm’n, *State of West Virginia: Medical Malpractice Report, Insurers With 5% Market Share (Nov. 2009)*, available at <http://wvinsurance.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=KHt9sy2Fod4%3d&tabid=207&mid=798> 13-14

W. Va. State of the State Address 2002, Jan. 10, 2002, available at <http://www.stateline.org/live/details/speech?contentId=16098>14

Charles A. Wright, *Damages for Personal Injuries*, 19 Ohio St. L.J. 155 (1958).....4

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether Florida's statutory upper limit on medical malpractice noneconomic damages, section 766.118, Florida Statutes, violates the Florida Constitution.

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE

As organizations representing Florida health care professionals, hospitals, small business owners, and their insurers, that depend upon access to affordable health care for their patients and employees, *amici* have a substantial interest in the continuing applicability of section 766.118, Florida Statutes. *Amici's* members support protections against subjective, runaway noneconomic damage awards and would be adversely impacted if the statute is nullified.

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

Amici adopt Appellee's Statement of the Facts.

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

Noneconomic damages awards, such as for pain and suffering, are highly subjective and inherently unpredictable because "juries are left with nothing but their consciences to guide them." Stanley Ingber, *Rethinking Intangible Injuries: A Focus on Remedy*, 73 Cal. L. Rev. 772, 778 (1985); *see also* Neil Vidmar, *Empirical Evidence on the Deep Pockets Hypothesis: Jury Awards for Pain and Suffering in Medical Malpractice Cases*, 43 Duke L.J. 217, 253-54 (1993).

As broad experience from across the nation demonstrates – and the Florida Legislature found after extensive research, *see* section 766.201, Florida Statutes, Governor’s Select Task Force on Healthcare Professional Liability Insurance, Report (2003), *available at* <http://www.doh.state.fl.us/myflorida/DOH-Large-Final%20Book.pdf> – noneconomic damages limits are an important element of a well-functioning state health care system. They control outlier awards, provide greater predictability in the medical liability system, lower insurance rates, reduce the cost of defensive medicine, and improve access to critical specialists for local residents. *See* Ronald M. Stewart, *Malpractice Risk and Cost Are Significantly Reduced After Tort Reform*, 212 J. Am. Coll. Surg. 463 (2011). They also promote more uniform treatment of individuals with comparable injuries, facilitate settlements, and limit arbitrariness that may raise potential due process problems. *See Gilbert v. DaimlerChrysler Corp.*, 685 N.W.2d 391, 400 n.22 (Mich. 2004), *cert. denied*, 546 U.S. 821 (2005) (“A grossly excessive award for pain and suffering may violate the Due Process Clause even if it is not labeled ‘punitive.’”).

The statute at issue here, section 766.118, Florida Statutes, was a rational legislative response to a medical malpractice insurance crisis that was identified by the Governor’s Task Force and by the American Medical Association, among other observers. *See* Task Force Report, *supra*, at iii. The Legislature drew a careful balance. To promote greater access to affordable health care for all Floridians, the

Legislature decided upon a very substantial, but not unlimited, remedy for the distinct minority of Floridians that may claim extraordinary noneconomic loss in medical malpractice cases. Overall, the law is pro-consumer despite the negative impacts to a few, such as Appellants. These impacts are lessened by the fact that, in addition to substantial noneconomic damages, plaintiffs' economic damages are uncapped and punitive damages may be available in appropriate cases. *Amici* urge the Court to uphold section 766.118 and join the clear majority of courts that have respected similar tort policy judgments by legislatures across the country.

ARGUMENT

I. THE EVOLUTION AND RISE OF NONECONOMIC DAMAGES

Initially, the common law rarely recognized damages beyond pecuniary harm. When awarded, noneconomic damages were generally modest and large awards were uniformly reversed. *See* Ronald J. Allen & Alexia Brunet, *The Judicial Treatment of Non-economic Compensatory Damages in the Nineteenth Century*, 4. J. Empirical Legal Stud. 365, 379-87 (2007).

Pain and suffering damages first leaped after World War II due to effective advocacy by plaintiffs' lawyers. *See* Melvin M. Belli, *The Adequate Award*, 39 Cal. L. Rev. 1 (1951). For example, during a 9-month period in 1957, there were 53 verdicts of \$100,000 or more nationwide, *see* Philip L. Merkel, *Pain and Suffering Damages at Mid-Twentieth Century: A Retrospective View of the*

Problem and the Legal Academy's First Responses, 34 *Cap. U. L. Rev.* 545, 568 (2006),¹ leading scholars to question such awards. *See, e.g.*, Charles A. Wright, *Damages for Personal Injuries*, 19 *Ohio St. L.J.* 155 (1958). In inflation-adjusted terms, the average pain and suffering award grew from \$38,000 in the 1940s and 1950s to \$48,000 in the 1960s. *See* David W. Leebron, *Final Moments: Damages for Pain and Suffering Prior to Death*, 64 *N.Y.U. L. Rev.* 256, 301 (1989). By 1971, pain and suffering constituted “the largest single item of recovery exceeding by far . . . medical expenses and lost wages.” *Nelson v. Keefer*, 451 F.2d 289, 294 (3d Cir. 1971).

This trend continued into the beginning of this century. *See* Perry J. Argires, *There Is an Attack on Medical Profession*, *Sunday News* (Lancaster, Pa.), May 16, 2004, at 1, *available at* 2004 WLNR 11275958 (citing Jury Verdict Research data). Based on data reported by Jury Verdict Research, average jury awards in medical liability cases, driven by large noneconomic damages, increased from just over \$1 million in 1994 to almost \$5 million in 2002, far outpacing other types of

¹ Scholars attribute this rise to: (1) the availability of future pain and suffering damages; (2) the rise in automobile ownership and personal injuries resulting from automobile accidents; (3) the greater availability of insurance and willingness of plaintiffs’ attorneys to take on more speculative cases; (4) the rise in affluence of the public and a change in public attitude that “someone should pay”; and (5) better organization by the plaintiffs’ bar. *See* Merkel, *supra*, at 553-66; *see also* Joseph H. King, Jr., *Pain and Suffering, Noneconomic Damages, and the Goals of Tort Law*, 57 *SMU L. Rev.* 163, 170 (2004).

claims. See Robert P. Hartwig, *Medical Malpractice Insurance & The Insurance Cycle: Medical Professional Liability & the P/C Insurance Industry*, at 57-58 (Ins. Info. Inst. May 15, 2008), available at http://www.iii.org/assets/docs/pdf/Medmal_preso1.pdf; see also Kim Brimer, *Has "Pain and Suffering" Priced Itself Out of the Market?*, Ins. J., Sept. 8, 2003, available at <http://www.insurancejournal.com/magazines/southcentral/2003/09/08/partingshots/32172.htm>. As Fourth Circuit Judge Paul Niemeyer explained, "money for pain and suffering . . . provides the grist for the mill of our tort industry." Paul V. Niemeyer, *Awards for Pain and Suffering: The Irrational Centerpiece of Our Tort System*, 90 Va. L. Rev. 1401, 1401 (2004).²

II. LIMITS ON SUBJECTIVE NONECONOMIC DAMAGES ARE A KEY COMPONENT OF ACCESSIBLE HEALTH CARE SYSTEMS

The Legislature acted reasonably in adopting section 766.118. Statutory upper limits on noneconomic damages promote access to more affordable health care, benefitting the vast majority of citizens that will never find themselves as plaintiffs in medical negligence lawsuits, while providing substantial compensation for plaintiffs that are harmed as a result of an accident in care.

² Due to the adoption of reforms across the country, tort costs from medical malpractice liability have generally remained stable since 2005. See Towers Watson, *U.S. Tort Cost Trends: 2010 Update*, at 17, available at <http://www.towerswatson.com/assets/pdf/3424/Towers-Watson-Tort-Report-1.pdf>. Nullification of limits on noneconomic damages such as those provided by section 766.118 would upset this trend and increase health care costs and premiums.

A. Avoiding Unpredictable and Excessive Awards

Through section 766.118, the Legislature sought to provide greater consistency and predictability in Florida's medical liability system. The Legislature made a rational judgment to promote access to more affordable health care for all Floridians by reining in extraordinary noneconomic damage awards. *See Ronen Avraham, An Empirical Study of the Impact of Tort Reforms on Medical Malpractice Settlement Payments*, 36 J. of Legal Studies S183, S221 (2007).

B. Reducing the Cost of Medical Liability Insurance

There is also a sizable body of literature demonstrating that limits on noneconomic damages can significantly lower medical liability insurance premiums. *See Carol Kane & David Emmons, The Impact of Liability Pressure and Caps on Damages on the Healthcare Market: An Update of Recent Literature* at 1 (Am. Med. Ass'n 2007), available at <http://www.ama-assn.org/ama1/pub/upload/mm/363/prp2007-1.pdf>. Insurers set premium rates to account for the level of uncertainty regarding the risk of loss. Statutory limits on pain and suffering awards provide a means for insurers to predict losses more accurately and thereby eliminate this "ambiguity premium," reducing costs to insured physicians.

On average, internal medicine premiums are 17.3% less in states with limits on noneconomic damages. *See Kane & Emmons, supra*, at 3 (citing Meredith L.

Kilgore et al., *Tort Law and Medical Malpractice Insurance Premiums*, 43 *Inquiry* 255 (2006)). Noneconomic damage limits have the greatest positive impact on doctors practicing in critical areas, such as obstetrics. *See id.*

C. Increasing Access to Health Care for Local Residents

In addition, “[m]any studies demonstrate that professional liability exposure has an important effect on recruitment of medical students to the field and retention of physicians with the field and within a particular state.” Robert L. Barbieri, *Professional Liability Payments in Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 107:3 *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 578, 578 (Mar. 2006). States with limits on noneconomic damages generally experience greater increases in the number of doctors per capita. *See* William E. Encinosa & Fred J. Hellinger, *Have State Caps on Malpractice Awards Increased the Supply of Physicians?*, 24 *Health Aff.* 250 (2005). If a state’s legal climate is not competitive, doctors will go elsewhere with profoundly deleterious consequences to that state’s health and economy. *See* Joseph Nixon, Editorial, *Why Doctors Are Heading to Texas*, *Wall St. J.*, May 17, 2008, at A9, *abstract available at* 2008 WLNR 9419738.³

³ *See also* Ralph Blumenthal, *More Doctors in Texas After Malpractice Cap*, *N.Y. Times*, Oct. 5, 2007, *available at* <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/05/us/05doctors.html>; Chiu-Fang Chou & Anthony T. Lo Sasso, *Practice Location Choice by New Physicians: The Importance of Malpractice Premiums, Damage Caps, and Health Professional Shortage Area Designation*, 44 *Health Serv. Res.* 1271 (2009), *available at* 2009 WLNR 15574372; Daniel P. Kessler et al., *Impact*

D. Reducing the Cost of Defensive Medicine

Furthermore, limits on noneconomic damages reduce the practice of “defensive” medicine, such as tests ordered out of excessive caution because of concern over potential liability rather than medical need. A 2005 survey in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* found that virtually 93% of high-risk specialists in Pennsylvania ordered unnecessary tests, performed unwarranted diagnostic procedures, and referred patients for unneeded consultations to protect themselves from litigation. See David M. Studdert et al., *Defensive Medicine Among High-Risk Specialist Physicians in a Volatile Malpractice Environment*, 293:1 JAMA 2609, 2609 (June 1, 2005). In a 2008 survey, 83% of Massachusetts physicians reported practicing defensive medicine; the survey also concluded that about 25% of all radiological imaging tests were ordered for defensive purposes, and 28% and 38%, respectively, of those surveyed admitted reducing the number of high-risk patients they saw and limiting the number of high-risk procedures or services they performed. See Massachusetts Medical Society, Press Release, *MMS First-of-its-kind Survey of Physicians Shows Extent and Cost of the Practice of Defensive Medicine and its Multiple Effects of Health Care on the State* (Nov. 17, 2008), available at <http://www.massmed.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=>

of Malpractice Reforms on the Supply of Physician Services, 293 JAMA 2618 (2005).

ID=23559. In a national survey, “79% of physicians said they had ordered more tests than they would, based only on professional judgment of what is medically needed, and 91% have noticed other physicians ordering more tests.” U.S. Dep’t of Health & Human Servs., *Confronting the New Health Care Crisis: Improving Health Care Quality and Lowering Costs By Fixing Our Medical Liability System* 4 (2002), available at <http://aspe.hhs.gov/daltcp/reports/litrefm.htm>. These costs are passed almost entirely to the consumer, if not directly, then indirectly through private or public insurance plans.

“[M]alpractice reforms that directly reduce provider liability pressure lead to reductions of 5 to 9 percent in medical expenditures without substantial effects on mortality or medical complications.” Donald J. Palmisano, *Health Care in Crisis: The Need for Medical Liability Reform*, 5 *Yale J. Health Pol’y, L. & Ethics* 371, 377 (2005) (quoting Daniel P. Kessler & Mark B. McClellan, *Do Doctors Practice Defensive Medicine?* 2 (Nat’l Bur. of Econ. Analysis, Working Paper No. 5466, 1996), available at <http://www.nber.org/papers/w5466.pdf>); see also Leonard J. Nelson et al., *Medical Malpractice Reform in Three Southern States*, 4 *J. Health & Biomedical L.* 69, 84 (2008) (studies “have found a link between the adoption of malpractice reforms and the reduction of defensive medical practices.”).

III. EXPERIENCE SHOWS THAT LIMITING NONECONOMIC DAMAGES IMPROVES ACCESSIBILITY TO HEALTH CARE

As examples of the benefits of limits on noneconomic damages on the health care system, this Court might look to the experience of other states. *Amici* bring to the Court's attention the experiences of Mississippi and West Virginia, because we believe them to be representative and because we understand that other *amici* intend to discuss states including California and Texas.

A. Case Study: Mississippi

Between 1999 and 2001, Mississippi experienced a surge in medical liability lawsuits. As one reporter wrote in 2002: "Mississippi, largely because it is one of only a few states that does not cap verdicts on noneconomic damages, has become a hotbed for such litigation because jury verdicts have been unusually high" Tim Lemke, *Best Places to Sue? Big Civil Verdicts in Mississippi Attract Major Litigators*, Wash. Times, June 30, 2002, at A1, available at 2002 WLNR 402634. Mississippi's health care system was negatively impacted. See Sherman Joyce & Michael Hotra, *Mississippi's Civil Justice System: Problems, Opportunities, and Some Suggested Repairs*, 71 Miss. L.J. 395, 417 (2001). By 2002, Mississippi had the lowest number of physicians per capita in the country and was losing doctors to other states. See Lynne Jeter, *Tort Reform Impact Ripples Out Through Economy*, Miss. Bus. J., Nov. 29, 2004, at S30, available at 2004 WL 14445074. Trying to recruit doctors to practice in the state was "a nightmare." *Id.* (quoting Mississippi

State Medical Association's past president Hugh Gamble II, M.D.). Other doctors restricted their practices due to liability concerns, *see* Sarag Domin, Comment, *Where Have All the Baby-Doctors Gone? Women's Access to Healthcare in Jeopardy: Obstetrics and the Medical Malpractice Insurance Crisis*, 53 Cath. U. L. Rev. 499 (2004), "leaving most Mississippi cities with populations of less than 20,000 people with no local obstetricians." *Id.* at 501.

The Mississippi legislature responded by adopting a \$500,000 noneconomic damage limit applicable in most medical liability actions, among other reforms, in late 2002. *See* H.B. 2, 2002 3rd Ex. Sess. (Miss. 2002) (codified at Miss. Code Ann. § 11-1-60(2)(a)). Two years later, the state legislature strengthened the 2002 law by deleting exceptions as well as scheduled increases in the limit. *See* H.B. 13, 2004 1st Ex. Sess., § 2 (Miss. 2004) (codified at Miss Code Ann. § 11-1-60(2)(a)).

Within two years, "the problems in malpractice insurance seem to have abated." Nelson et al., *supra*, at 139. The number of tort lawsuits against Mississippi physicians, especially OB/GYNs, has fallen dramatically. *See* Mark A. Behrens, *Medical Liability Reform: A Case Study of Mississippi*, 118:2 *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 335 (Aug. 2011) (from 2005-2009, average lawsuits per year against physicians insured by Mississippi's leading medical liability insurer dropped significantly from pre-tort reform years, with even fewer average lawsuits per year against OB/GYNs). Medical liability insurance premiums have been both

reduced and refunded each year since the legislation was implemented. *See* American Medical Association, *Medical Liability Reform – NOW!*, at 24 (Feb. 1, 2011), *available at* <http://www.ama-assn.org/ama1/pub/upload/mm/378/mlr-now-2011.pdf>. No longer considered a “crisis” state for medical liability insurance, *see* Amy Lynn Sorrel, *Tort Reforms Boost Some States' Liability Outlook*, *Am. Med. News*, Mar. 5, 2007, *available at* <http://www.ama-assn.org/amednews/2007/03/05/prsc0305.htm>, Mississippi went “from being the poster child of litigation abuse to a shining example of how a state can join the legal mainstream and foster economic growth through legal reform.” Mark A. Behrens & Cary Silverman, *Now Open for Business: The Transformation of Mississippi's Legal Climate*, 24 *Miss. C.L. Rev.* 393, 395 (2005).

B. Case Study: West Virginia

In 2002, the National Governors Association listed West Virginia as a case study of a medical malpractice insurance crisis. *See* National Governors Ass'n Center for Best Practices, *Addressing the Medical Malpractice Insurance Crisis*, at 12 (2002), *available at* <http://www.nga.org/cda/files/1102medmalpractice.pdf>. West Virginia doctors paid substantially higher premiums than those in neighboring Ohio and Virginia, liability carriers reported substantially higher defense costs than the national average, and a lead medical malpractice insurer left the market. *Id.* Four in ten physicians were considering leaving West Virginia,

30% were considering retirement, and all or part of 50 of 55 counties were considered medically underserved. *Id.* From the mid 1990s to 2002 there was a decline in the number of new licenses issued, *see* W. Va. Bd. of Med., *Licensure Activity*, available at <http://www.wvbom.wv.gov/activity.asp>, demonstrating that West Virginia was an undesirable place to practice medicine.

As a result, residents in several areas of the state had little or no local access to neurosurgeons and trauma surgeons. *See, e.g.*, Therese Smith Cox, *Doctors Facing Dilemma: Neurosurgeons Must Pay Big Malpractice Fee or Leave*, Charleston Gazette, Apr. 10, 2002, at A1, available at 2002 WL 1053244; Dawn Miller, *CAMC Loses Trauma Status: People With Serious Multiple Injuries To Go To Morgantown, Elsewhere*, Charleston Gazette, Aug. 24, 2002, at 1A, available at 2002 WLNR 1058321. In fact, in early 2003, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists issued a “red alert” for West Virginia, finding that the state’s high OB/GYN’s premiums, *second highest only to premiums paid by Florida doctors*, threatened the ability of physicians to deliver babies. *See* American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, *The Current Tort System* (2003), available at http://www.acog.org/from_home/publications/press_releases/Stats-ACM03-CurrentTorts.pdf (emphasis added).

West Virginia’s Insurance Commissioner recognized that “[h]igher and more volatile jury awards” contributed to the crisis. *See* W. Va. Offices of the Ins.

Comm'n'r, State of West Virginia: Medical Malpractice Report, Insurers With 5% Market Share 2 (Nov. 2009) [hereinafter W. Va. Rep.], *available at* <http://wvinsurance.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=KHt9sy2Fod4%3d&tabid=207&mid=798>. Governor Bob Wise declared the “collapse of the medical malpractice insurance system.” W. Va. State of the State Address 2002, Jan. 10, 2002, *available at* <http://www.stateline.org/live/details/speech?contentId=16098>.

In that ominous environment, the West Virginia legislature replaced a \$1 million limit on noneconomic damages with a tiered system that caps pain and suffering awards at \$250,000 in most medical professional liability cases and up to \$500,000 for certain severe, permanent injuries. *See* W. Va. Code § 55-7B-8. In the four years following enactment, the average premium per physician dropped nearly by half. W. Va. Rep., *supra*, at 51. Physicians insured with the state’s largest medical malpractice insurer experienced an overall average decrease in premiums of 32% with many specialists receiving as much as a 55% reduction since the insurer formed in 2004. *See* W. Va. Mut. Ins. Co., Annual Rep. 2 (2009), *available at* <http://www.wvmic.com/docs/2009%20WV%20Mutual%20Annual%20Report.pdf>. The insurer directly attributes its ability to provide rate relief for policyholders to the 2003 reforms. *See* W. Va. Mut. Ins. Co., Quarterly Coverage (Spring 2011), *available at* <http://www.wvmic.com/docs/QuarterlyCoverageSpring2011.pdf>. The number of actively licensed physicians increased

from 3,532 in 2004 to 3,864 in 2010. *See* W. Va. Bd. of Med., Licensure Activity, *supra*.

IV. NUMEROUS STATES HAVE UPHELD LIMITS ON NONECONOMIC DAMAGES

As shown, Florida is not alone in trying to restrain outlier pain and suffering awards. Most other states have placed bounds on noneconomic damage awards, and many states have adopted limits specifically applicable to health care liability actions.⁴

Many state courts that have considered the constitutionality of noneconomic damage limits applicable to medical liability claims have upheld the legislature's prerogative to set needed bounds on inherently subjective awards in order to preserve access to the health care system.⁵ At least four state courts have upheld

⁴ *See, e.g.*, Alaska Stat. § 09.55.549; Cal. Civ. Code § 3333.2(b); Colo. Rev. Stat. § 13-64-302; Ind. Code § 34-18-14-3; La. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 40:1299.42; Md. Cts. & Jud. Proc. Code Ann. § 3-2A-09; Mich. Comp. Laws § 600.1483; Miss. Code Ann. § 11-1-60(2)(a); Mo. Rev. Stat. § 538.210; Neb. Rev. Stat. § 44-2825; N.C. Gen. Stat. § 90-21.19 (added by N.C. Sess. L. 2011-400); Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 2323.43; S.C. Code Ann. § 15-32-220; S.D. Codified Laws § 21-3-11; Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Ann. § 74.301; W. Va. Code § 55-7B-8. Several states have enacted limits on noneconomic damages applicable to all personal injury claims. *See, e.g.*, Alaska Stat. § 09.17.010; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 13-21-102.5(3)(a); Haw. Rev. Stat. § 663-8.7; Idaho Code § 6-1603; Kan. Stat. Ann. § 60-19a02(b); Md. Ct. & Jud. Proc. Code Ann. § 11-108; Miss. Code Ann. § 11-1-60(2)(b); Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 2315.18; 23 Okla. Stat. § 61.2; Tenn. Code Ann. § 29-39-102 (applying to actions accruing on or after Oct. 1, 2011).

⁵ *See Fein v. Permanente Med. Group*, 695 P.2d 665 (Cal. 1985); *Stinnett v. Tam*, 2011 WL 3862642 (Cal. App. Sept. 1, 2011); *Van Buren v. Evans*, 2009 WL

laws that go further – by limiting total recovery in medical malpractice cases, not just the noneconomic damage portion of the award.⁶ Several other courts have upheld the constitutionality of limits on noneconomic damages that apply to all personal injury actions, not only those involving medical malpractice claims.⁷ Most recently, West Virginia’s highest court upheld that state’s limit on noneconomic damages, discussed earlier. *See MacDonald v. City Hosp., Inc.*,

1396235 (Cal. App. May 20, 2009); *Yates v. Pollock*, 194 Cal. App. 3d 195 (1987); *Univ. of Miami v. Echarte*, 618 So. 2d 189 (Fla.), *cert. denied*, 510 U.S. 915 (1993); *HCA Health Servs. of Fla., Inc. v. Branchesi*, 620 So. 2d 176 (Fla. 1993); *Parham v. Florida Health Sciences Ctr., Inc.*, 35 So. 3d 920 (Fla. 2d DCA 2010); *Butler v. Flint Goodrich Hosp. of Dillard Univ.*, 607 So. 2d 517 (La. 1992); *Zdrojewski v. Murphy*, 657 N.W.2d 721 (Mich. App. 2002); *Rose v. Doctors Hosp.*, 801 S.W.2d 841 (Tex. 1990); *Judd v. Drezga*, 103 P.3d 135 (Utah 2004); *MacDonald v. City Hosp., Inc.*, 2011 WL 2517201 (W. Va. June 22, 2011); *Estate of Verba v. Ghaphery*, 552 S.E.2d 406 (W. Va. 2001); *Robinson v. Charleston Area Med. Ctr., Inc.*, 414 S.E.2d 877 (W. Va. 1991); *see also Weingrad v. Miles*, 29 So. 3d 406 (Fla. 3d DCA 2010).

⁶ *See Garhart v. Columbia/Healthone, L.L.C.*, 95 P.3d 571 (Colo. 2004); *Gourley v. Neb. Methodist Health Sys., Inc.*, 663 N.W.2d 43 (Neb. 2003); *Pulliam v. Coastal Emer. Servs. of Richmond, Inc.*, 509 S.E.2d 307 (Va. 1999); *Etheridge v. Med. Ctr. Hosp.*, 376 S.E.2d 525 (Va. 1989); *Johnson v. St. Vincent Hosp.*, 404 N.E.2d 585 (Ind. 1980).

⁷ *See C.J. v. Dep’t of Corrections*, 151 P.3d 373 (Alaska 2006); *Evans ex rel. Kutch v. State*, 56 P.3d 1046 (Alaska 2002); *Scholz v. Metro. Pathologists, P.C.*, 851 P.2d 901 (Colo. 1993); *Scharrel v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 949 P.2d 89 (Colo. Ct. App. 1998); *Kirkland v. Blaine County Med. Ctr.*, 4 P.3d 1115 (Idaho 2000); *Samsel v. Wheeler Transp. Servs., Inc.*, 789 P.2d 541 (Kan. 1990), *overruled in part on other grounds*, *Bair v. Peck*, 811 P.2d 1176 (Kan. 1991); *DRD Pool Serv. Inc. v. Freed*, 5 A.3d 45 (Md. 2010); *Oaks v. Connors*, 600 A.2d 423 (Md. 1995); *Murphy v. Edmonds*, 601 A.2d 102 (Md. 1992); *Arbino v. Johnson & Johnson*, 880 N.E.2d 420 (Ohio 2007).

2011 WL 2517201 (W. Va. June 22, 2011). In 2010, Maryland's highest court held that the state's generally applicable noneconomic damages cap did not violate the right to jury trial or right to remedy provisions of the Maryland Constitution, or the equal protection provisions of the Maryland or United States Constitutions. *See DRD Pool Serv., Inc. v. Freed*, 5 A.3d 45 (Md. 2010). State courts have also upheld noneconomic damage limits in various other contexts.⁸ These state courts are joined by several federal courts that have rejected challenges based on the United States Constitution, including the Eleventh Circuit in this case, or an interpretation of applicable state law.⁹ Moreover, two federal district courts that

⁸ *See Samples v. Florida Birth-Related Neurological Injury Comp. Ass'n*, 40 So. 3d 18 (Fla. 5th DCA 2010); *King v. Virginia Birth-Related Neurological Injury Comp. Program*, 410 S.E.2d 656 (Va. 1991); *Vick v. Schulman*, 2001 WL 1829895 (Va. Cir. Ct. Dec. 21, 2001); *Wessels v. Garden Way, Inc.*, 689 N.W.2d 526 (Mich. App. 2004); *Mizrahi v. North Miami Med. Ctr., Ltd.*, 761 So. 2d 1040 (Fla. 2000); *Leiker v. Gafford*, 778 P.2d 823 (Kan. 1989); *Adams v. Via Christi Reg'l Med. Ctr.*, 19 P.3d 132 (Kan. 2001); *Peters v. Saft*, 597 A.2d 50 (Me. 1991); *Schweich v. Ziegler, Inc.*, 463 N.W.2d 722 (Minn. 1990); *Lawson v. Hoke*, 119 P.3d 210 (Or. 2005).

⁹ *See, e.g., Estate of McCall ex rel. McCall v. United States*, 642 F.3d 944 (11th Cir. 2011) (upholding application of Florida's statutory cap on noneconomic medical liability damages against challenge on federal constitutional grounds); *Hoffman v. United States*, 767 F.2d 1431 (9th Cir. 1985) (Cal.); *Patton v. TIC United Corp.*, 77 F.3d 1235 (10th Cir) (Kan.), *cert. denied*, 518 U.S. 1005 (1996); *Smith v. Botsford Gen. Hosp.*, 419 F.3d 513 (6th Cir. 2005) (Mich.), *cert. denied*, 347 U.S. 1111 (2006); *Boyd v. Bulala*, 877 F.2d 1191 (4th Cir. 1989) (Va.); *Davis v. Omitowaju*, 883 F.2d 1155 (3d Cir. 1989) (Virgin Islands); *Owen v. United States*, 935 F.2d 734 (5th Cir. 1991) (La.), *cert. denied*, 502 U.S. 1031 (1992); *Federal Express Corp. v. United States*, 228 F. Supp. 2d 1267 (D. N.M. 2002) (N.M.); *Simms v. Holiday Inns, Inc.*, 746 F. Supp. 596 (D. Md. 1990) (Md.);

carefully considered the constitutionality of section 766.118, Florida Statutes, under various provisions of both the United States and Florida's constitutions upheld the Florida Legislature's authority to address the statewide medical liability insurance crisis through adoption of the statutory limit along with other measures. *See M.D. v. United States*, 745 F. Supp. 2d 1274, 1297-1308 (M.D. Fla. 2010); *Estate of McCall ex rel. McCall v. United States*, 663 F. Supp. 2d 1276 (N.D. Fla. 2009), *aff'd in part, question certified*, 642 F.3d 944 (11th Cir. 2011). While these decisions are not binding upon this Court with respect to questions of Florida constitutional law, they provide cogent analysis and persuasive reasoning for the Court's consideration.

While some state courts have engaged in judicial nullification of such laws, including, most recently, Georgia and Illinois,¹⁰ the clear trend is to uphold such legislation. *See* Carly N. Kelly & Michelle M. Mello, *Are Medical Malpractice*

Franklin v. Mazda Motor Corp., 704 F. Supp. 1325 (D. Md. 1989) (Md.); *Watson v. Hortman*, 2010 WL 3566736 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 13, 2010) (Tex.).

¹⁰ For cases striking down limits on noneconomic damages, *see Moore v. Mobile Infirmary Assoc.*, 592 So. 2d 156 (Ala. 1991); *Smith v. Dep't of Ins.*, 507 So. 2d 1080 (Fla. 1987) (\$450,000 cap); *Atlanta Oculoplastic Surgery, P.C. v. Nestlehutt*, 691 S.E.2d 218 (Ga. 2010); *LeBron v. Gottlieb Mem. Hosp.*, 930 N.E.2d 895 (Ill. 2010); *Brannigan v. Usitalo*, 587 A.2d 1232 (N.H. 1991); *Arneson v. Olson*, 270 N.W.2d 125 (N.D. 1978); *Lakin v. Senco Prods. Inc.*, 987 P.2d 463 (Or. 1999); *Lucas v. United States*, 757 S.W.2d 687 (Tex. 1988); *Sofie v. Fibreboard Corp.*, 771 P.2d 711 (Wash. 1989); *Ferdon v. Wisconsin Patients Comp. Fund*, 701 N.W.2d 440 (Wis. 2005); *see also Klotz v. St. Anthony's Med. Ctr.*, 311 S.W.3d 752 (Mo. 2010) (retroactive application to accrued claims).

Damages Caps Constitutional? An Overview of State Litigation, 33 J.L. Med. & Ethics 515, 527 (2005) (“Over the years, the scales in state courts have increasingly tipped toward upholding noneconomic damages caps.”). More than twice as many state courts of last resort have upheld statutory limits on noneconomic damages awards than have struck them down, including with respect to equal protection¹¹ or jury trial¹² provisions like those in Florida.

These courts have recognized, “It is not this court’s place to second-guess the Legislature’s reasoning behind passing the act,” *Gourley v. Neb. Methodist Health Sys., Inc.*, 663 N.W.2d 43, 69 (Neb. 2003); *see also* Victor E. Schwartz et al., *Fostering Mutual Respect and Cooperation Between State Courts and State Legislatures: A Sound Alternative to a Tort Tug of War*, 103 W. Va. L. Rev. 1 (2000).

¹¹ *See, e.g., Echarte*, 618 So. 2d at 191; *MacDonald*, 2011 WL 2517201; *DRD Pool Serv.*, 5 A.3d at 57; *Arbino*, 880 N.E.2d at 424; *Butler*, 607 So. 2d at 521; *Fein*, 695 P.2d at 683; *Rose*, 801 S.W.2d at 846.

¹² The vast majority of courts have upheld caps on noneconomic damages in right to jury trial challenges notwithstanding state guarantees that the right to jury trial shall remain “inviolable.” *See Echarte*, 618 So. 2d at 191; *L.D.G., Inc. v. Brown*, 211 P.3d 1110, 1131 (Alaska 2009); *Fein*, 695 P.2d at 680; *Kirkland*, 4 P.3d at 1120; *Johnson*, 404 N.E.2d at 602; *Samsel*, 789 P.2d at 555; *DRD Pool Serv.*, 5 A.3d at 57; *Wessels*, 689 N.W.2d at 595; *Adams*, 832 S.W.2d at 907; *Arbino*, 880 N.E.2d at 432; *Pulliam*, 509 S.E.2d at 315.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, *amici curiae* urge this Court to answer all certified questions in the negative and declare section 766.118, Florida Statutes, to be constitutional.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael L. Rosen (Fla. Bar No. 243531)
SHOOK HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
100 N. Tampa Street, Suite 2900
Tampa, FL 33602-5810
Phone: (813) 202-7100
Fax: (813) 221-8837
mrosen@shb.com

Mark A. Behrens (*pro hac*)
Cary Silverman (*pro hac*)
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
1155 F Street, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20004
Phone: (202) 783-8400
Fax: (202) 783-4211
mbehrens@shb.com
csilverman@shb.com

Counsel for *Amici Curiae*

Dated: September 20, 2011

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on September 20, 2011, a copy of the foregoing Brief was sent by U.S. Mail in a first-class postage-prepaid envelope addressed to the following:

Henry T. Courtney
Sara Courtney-Baigorri
THE COURTNEY LAW FIRM
110 Merrick Way, Suite 3A
Coral Gables, FL 33134
Counsel for Appellants

Robert S. Peck
Valerie M. Nannery
CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL
LITIGATION, P.C.
777 6th Street, NW, Suite 520
Washington, DC 20001
Counsel for Appellants

Stephen S. Poche
THE LAW OFFICES OF STEPHEN POCHE
1270 N. Eglin Parkway, Suite C-14
Shalimar, FL 32579
Counsel for Appellants

Daniel J. Lenerz
Thomas M. Bondy
Attorneys, Appellate Staff
Civil Division, Room 7234
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Counsel for Appellee

Joel Stephen Perwin
JOEL S. PERWIN, P.A.
169 East Flagler Street, Suite 1422
Miami, FL 33131

Pamela Adele Moine
U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
21 East Garden Street, Suite 400
Pensacola, FL 32502

Herman J. Russomanno
Robert J. Borrello
Herman J. Russomanno III
RUSSOMANNO & BORRELLO, P.A.
150 West Flagler Street
Museum Tower, Penthouse 2800
Miami, FL 33130

Lincoln J. Connolly
ROSSMAN BAUMBERGER
44 West Flagler Street
23rd Floor – Courthouse Tower
Miami, FL 33130

John S. Mills
Andrew D. Manko
THE MILLS FIRM, P.A.
203 North Gadsden Street, Suite 1A
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Chris Nuland
LAW OFFICES OF CHRISTOPHER NULAND
1000 Riverside Avenue, Suite 115
Jacksonville, FL 32204

Raoul Cantero
David Draigh
WHITE & CASE LLP
200 S. Biscayne Blvd., Suite 4900
Miami, FL 33131

Louis F. Hubener III
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
The Capitol, PL01
Tallahassee, FL 32399

George N. Meros, Jr.
Allen Winsor
GRAY ROBINSON, P.A.
301 S. Bronough Street, Suite 600
Tallahassee, FL 32301

George S. Christian
CHRISTIAN & CO.
400 W. 15th Street, Suite 400
Austin, TX 78701

Mark Hicks
Dinaeh Stein
HICKS, PORTER, EBENFELD &
STEIN, P.A.
799 Brickell Plaza, Suite 900
Miami, FL 33131

William W. Large
FLORIDA JUSTICE
REFORM INSTITUTE
210 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Arthur J. England, Jr.
Christopher B. Carbot
GREENBERG TRAUIG, P.A.
333 Avenue of the Americas
Suite 4400
Miami, FL 33131

Diane G. DeWolf
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR
GENERAL
The Capitol, PL01
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Cynthia Tunicliff
PENNINGTON, MOORE,
WILKINSON, BELL & DUNBAR
215 South Monroe St., 2d Floor
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Fred Hiestand
THE CIVIL JUSTICE
ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA
2001 P Street, Suite 110
Sacramento, CA 95811



Michael L. Rosen (Fla. Bar No. 243531)

SHOOK HARDY & BACON L.L.P.

100 N. Tampa Street, Suite 2900

Tampa, FL 33602-5810


Phone: (813) 202-7100

Fax: (813) 221-8837

mrosen@shb.com

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 9.210

I certify that the foregoing Brief is submitted in Times New Roman 14-point font and complies with the requirements of Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure Rule 9.210.



Michael L. Rosen (Fla. Bar No. 243531)
SHOOK HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
100 N. Tampa Street, Suite 2900
Tampa, FL 33602-5810
Phone: (813) 202-7100
Fax: (813) 221-8837
mrosen@shb.com

September 20, 2011